NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (WPNSTA), SEAL BEACH RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) AND COMMUNITY MEETING AUGUST 11, 1999

Participants:

Campbell, Donald

Castillon, Rich

Dick, Andrew/Southwest Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SWDIV)

Eells, Brenda/CH2M HILL

Hannon, Patricia/Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region (RWQCB)

Keddington, Laura

Leibel, Katherine/ Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)

Nguyen, Dien/Orange County Environmental Health

Peoples, J.P.

Saunders, Lee/SWDIV

Sebring, Fred

Smith, Gregg/WPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer Tamashiro, Pei-Fen/WPNSTA Seal Beach and Navy Co-chair Unrath, John

Voce, Mario/Community Co-chair

Welz, Ed

Willhite, Lindi

Wong, Bryant/CH2M HILL

Woodside, Greg/Orange County Water District (OCWD)

WELCOME

At 7:00 p.m., P. Tamashiro opened the meeting by welcoming the participants to the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting and introduced herself as the new Navy Co-Chair. P. Tamashiro introduced G. Smith, the WPNSTA, Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer and K. Leibel, the new DTSC Remedial Project Manager replacing Rafat Abbasi. M. Voce welcomed P. Tamashiro as the incoming Navy co-chair replacing Rob Robinson. M. Voce requested that RAB members hold their questions until the end of the presentations because of the length of the evening's presentations and in order to stay on-schedule.

PROJECT HIGHLIGHTS

A. Dick provided the RAB with highlights of the WPNSTA, Seal Beach's Installation Restoration (IR) Program projects status. Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. Questions and answers made following the presentation are summarized below:

Question: Will the Navy be sampling water at Site 7?

Answer: The media to be sampled at Site 7 include mussels, near shore sediments, groundwater seeps, and any specific areas where discolored water and/or

sediments were reportedly observed.

Question: When will the Site 7 sampling take place?

Answer: Sampling at Site 7 will take place in October and

November 1999.

Question: What contaminants are suspected at Site 73, the

Water Tower Area?

Answer: Lead is the main suspected contaminant at the

Water Tower Area, due to series of sandblasting and painting activities over the life of the

tower.

PHASE II FOCUSED SITE INSPECTION WORK PLAN

B. Wong from CH2M HILL provided the RAB with a presentation on the Phase II Focused Site Inspection Work Plan. Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. During B. Wong's discussion of Site 73, the Water Tower Area, P. Tamashiro made the following announcement:

The reason for adding the Water Tower Area to the Phase II Focused Site Inspection is that a few months ago, the WPNSTA, Seal Beach's environmental division received a request from the Public Work Department for seismic retrofitting the water tower footings. A test of soil samples near the water tower revealed elevated concentrations of lead, which prompted additional investigation at the site. Now that the water tower site becomes an IR site, it is Navy's policy to inform the RAB members of any projects at an IR site. This statement constitutes our formal announcement of

the seismic retrofitting project at the water tower site to the RAB members.

Questions and answers made following B. Wong's presentation are summarized below:

Question: It seems like a lot of money is being spent

without consideration for costs. Has any thought been given to the amount of money being spent?

Answer:

Cost is one of many major considerations in the development of the sampling strategy. For this Phase II Focused Site Inspection, in particular, the Navy has tried to develop a focused approach targeted to fill only specific data gaps and to build on previous investigations whenever possible, rather than repeating past work. several cases, the need for additional sampling could not have been anticipated by previous studies because, as it turned out, the assumed "background" sampling location appears to be contaminated; such surprises cannot be ignored. At most of these sites, additional investigation is being conducted to comply with State regulatory and RAB requests. The Navy is committed to resolving regulatory agency comments regarding human health and environmental protection.

Comment:

Seismic retrofitting of the Water Tower is not a good idea because it is located within a few feet of a major fault, the Newport-Inglewood Fault.

Question: It seems as though the sampling pattern for the Water Tower Area should follow prevailing wind direction.

Answer:

The point is a good one and was given consideration during the development of the sampling strategy. We may discover that the contamination does fall into a prevailing wind pattern, but the initial samples should follow a randomized sample orientation for statistical integrity.

Question: Are you sure shots are expected to be found as far as 150 yards at the skeet range?

Answer:

The distribution of the shots will vary depending on the type of gun used and angle of the shooting. This distance is based on experience gained from sampling at other skeet ranges and from interviewing former users of the skeet range.

Question: It looks like from your sampling map for the skeet range that you are collecting samples from areas that would be blocked by the small arms berm.

Answer: The work plan's authors were careful to cut-off the angle of the sampling pattern so that we are not wasting our time sampling in areas that are impossible for shots to reach. We will check the sampling map to be sure this is the case.

Question: I've read that higher arsenic levels are naturally occurring in Orange County.

Answer: We have done an extensive literature search on the natural variability of arsenic in soils of Southern California. We have not come across any studies that indicate the arsenic levels we are seeing may be within naturally-occurring ranges of arsenic for Southern California or Orange County. For at least 10 years now, I have personally been looking for a study or reference that indicates the soils in Southern California have naturally higher arsenic content. If you do come across a reference that indicates that arsenic in these areas are naturally elevated, I would appreciate a call.

Question: At Site 25, the Navy will be analyzing for explosive components. What are those explosive components?

Answer: The Navy will be analyzing these samples using a standard laboratory method approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) called EPA Method 8330. EPA Method 8330 provides an analysis for a broad range of explosives.

Question: At SWMU 24, what was burned?

Answer: Expended munitions were burned in the Stationary Demilitarization Furnace at SWMU 24 as a means for destroying them.

Question: Was there a scrub system for emissions prior to going up the stack? Is there any reason to suspect dioxin at this site? Is the Navy looking for organics at this site?

Answer: There was no scrub system, but there was a cyclone and bag house to collect particulate matter from the exhaust of the furnace. Dioxin is not a suspected chemical of concern because there was no source of chlorinated compounds. There is no reason to look for organics at the site because

the munitions destroyed at this facility did not contain organic compounds. Therefore, the Navy is only looking for metals.

Question: At SWMU 57, semivolatile organic compounds (SVOC) are not mentioned. Why?

Answer: The analyses that will be run on soil samples collected from SWMU 57 were determined from what were previously detected at the "hot" sample.

Only volatile organic compounds and metals are proposed for analysis at SWMU 57 because they were the only chemicals detected in the previous site inspection. SVOCs were not detected.

Question: For Building 128 Strip Pit, are there technical data sheets?

Answer: Yes, technical data sheets were used to help develop the sampling strategy.

Question: What kind of cyanide is being looked for at Building 128 Strip Pit?

Answer: Total cyanide.

Question: At SWMU 57, why is the sampling taking place at a different location than at the Paint Locker Area?

Answer: At SWMU 57, the area thought to be contaminated was found to be "clean", while the background sample taken farther away from the site was found to be contaminated. Therefore, the sampling area is located where the assumed "background" sample was taken.

Question: At Site 25, if water from fire fighting activities was drained outside, why are samples being taken inside the courtyard?

Answer: New information received after the last site inspection at Site 25 indicated that, occasionally, the water may have been discharged inside the courtyard of Building 95.

Question: At Site 25, how do you know that the area being sampled for the test burn area is really the right area?

Answer: We can see the trench where the cartridge actuated devices (CAD) burning took place and the activity was recent, so we have high confidence in the location.

Question: Where did the spills and liquids collect in the sump discharge to?

Answer: Liquids collected in the sump were discharged to

two holding tanks located just outside Building 128 a few years ago. Because of Navy's intent to close these tanks, now they are pumped into a

baker tank outside the building.

Question: Are these holding tanks above ground or

underground storage tanks?

Answer: They are above ground storage tanks.

Question: Where do they go from there?

Answer: The storage tanks were pumped out periodically and

the liquids were managed as hazardous waste. These tanks were permitted under the base's Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)

permit.

Question: What is the "industrial waste treatment system"

shown in the Building 128 Strip Pit sampling

slide?

Answer: This is where the future industrial wastewater

pretreatment system will be installed. It is not

yet installed. Presently, the strip pit

operations are shutdown and will be refurbished. Part of the refurbishment is to install a new

pretreatment system.

COMMUNITY FORUM

No announcements were made.

FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS

No future agenda topics were suggested. P. Tamashiro requested that any future agenda topics or comments be sent to her in written form, rather than voice mails. M. Voce told RAB members that they could send him suggested agenda topics and he would send them on to P. Tamashiro.

ADJOURNMENT

M. Voce adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.